



## MEETING SUMMARY

**CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013  
SALT AND SALINITY MANAGEMENT RMS WORKSHOP  
1:00 – 4:30 P.M.  
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA**

### Meeting Objectives

1. Outline key information for the Salt and Salinity Resource Management Strategy (RMS)
2. Obtain feedback on suggested edits.

### Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

A workshop was held on April 25, 2012 to discuss revisions to the Salt and Salinity Management RMS. Lisa Beutler, Executive Facilitator, reviewed the agenda for the workshop and introductions were made around the room and on the phone.

### Overview

Jeanne Schubert, with the Central Valley Water Boards, co-authored this RMS with Jose Faria of DWR. Ms. Schubert noted that several people were involved in revising this document, including those working on the CV-Salts Program. The following changes were made to the previous version of the document:

- greater emphasis of the statewide implications of salinity
- costs associated with not addressing this water quality challenge
- expanded discussion on the Delta, Salton Sea and Colorado River
- additional case studies

Information was also updated on salt loading and management options. Costs of management practices were included and the need for a reliable water balance was highlighted.

The RMS recommendations were re-organized into four short-term recommendations, with the longer-term recommendations being grouped into five categories. The finance section of the 2009 RMS was deleted, with the funding discussion directed to the Water Plan itself.

### Finance Considerations

Paul Massera, DWR, Update 2013 Program Manager, provided a presentation on the overall approach for addressing funding and finance recommendations in the Water Plan – as well as how specific RMS funding and finance considerations will be incorporated into Update 2013. This approach implements an Update 2009 recommendation to develop a finance plan. This is an important element, since many RMSs have identified funding constraints as significant barriers to implementation.



For Update 2013, a new approach is being developed to better integrate the range of funding recommendations from across all the RMSs. The Finance Plan table of contents was introduced, highlighting the chapters that will address: IWM activities, existing funding, funding sustainability, future costs and funding tradeoffs and options. The role of the State and partnerships is also described in the Finance Plan and this is where RMS recommendations will be described, as well as in the chapter on funding options and tradeoffs.

A workshop on the Finance plan is currently scheduled for the afternoon of July 18<sup>th</sup> to discuss the funding approach in greater detail. A key consideration for the workshop will be looking at fund sources, as well as funding recommendations. The cumulative impact of fees and pass-through funding recommendations will need to be assessed. The workshop will also describe the level of RMS funding estimates and the range of potential finance alternatives. It is anticipated that a funding database will be developed, allowing finance recommendations to be reported out according to different categories – for example, by RMS, by benefit type, by funding source, etc.

## Document Walk Through

Ms. Beutler explained the structure of the RMS chapters which uses a standard template to describe: background, benefits, costs, major issues or challenges, recommendations and references. The background section provides a definition of the RMS and explains how it is being addressed in the state. It was noted that the section on Costs of Salt and Salinity Management looks at costs of implementation. Also, recommendations must be linked to an earlier RMS entry to either leverage best practices or overcome challenges. Comments on the document section are provided below.

### SECTION 1: Background

- The last section says “possibly” groundwater recharge. The word “possibly” should be deleted.
- Page 18-3: The last full paragraph references underground tunnels beneath the Delta – replace this with something more general, such as an alternative Delta conveyance. This is pre-decisional and needs to be carefully worded. It could be addressed by saying “reducing salt loads by up to 1 million...”
- Page 18-4: Quality of groundwater. MWD will send in comments for this.
- Indicate that salt is transported by air as well as water.

### SECTION 2: Salt and Salinity in California

- In the first line, the term “mismanaged” sets a negative tone. Perhaps say “not optimally” managed.
- Page 18-8: It was clarified that the numbers on gypsum were taken from the 2006 report by the Department of Food and Ag.
- Page 18-9, second paragraph, first sentence: Alternatives must be evaluated in the context of resource and environmental needs. For example, looking at whether or not an approach to manage salinity will impact nutrient loads. It is important to look at alternatives using a systems approach.



## SECTION 3: Potential Benefits

- (no comments)

## SECTION 4: Potential Costs

- (CDFA will submit comments)

## SECTION 5: Major Issues

This section will discuss barriers or factors that need to be taken into account to successfully deliver a salt and salinity management program.

- Page 18-13, Common Understanding: Coachella should be added and the Colorado River Basin and Santa Ana areas.
- Page 18-14, first bullet: This seems to be a one-sided perspective. Conversely, high quality is being delivered that does not need to be treated. Carbon costs are associated with downstream treatment. This should be looked at from a systems perspective and consider other constraints such as nitrates and groundwater.
- Page 18-15, the last two bullets: These should reference the figure for salt loads.

**ACTION ITEM:** Add a bullet to describe a system framework for understanding effects. For example, on page 18-14, the fourth sentence in the second paragraph captures some of the relationships (and vice versa).

There was a discussion that the first figure for each RMS would show the relationships of the RMS to other RMSs. This helps show the overlap of the issues.

## SECTION 6: Recommendations

Recommendations must address issues or benefits and must tie directly to how the topic is framed in the chapter. The discussion on recommendations focused first on non-funding recommendations and then addressed finance considerations. Short-term recommendations received the following comments:

- IRWM question: There need to be options for people on small water systems or single domestic wells. Can IRWM help fund smaller users? Ensuring that funding certain types of systems is important. Are we asking the legislature and IRWM program to prioritize funding?
- It is not clear if this issue should be funded and managed by the state, regionally or by the impacted industries.
- Page 18-17, last bullet: There are concerns about monitoring program costs in disadvantaged communities. This recommendation is so inclusive; we may not want to cover all projects. What project might not have a monitoring component? Public Health needs to be part of this discussion.

The conversation on longer-term recommendations provided the following suggestions:



- The concept of investigating brine lines needs to be pursued. This would be similar to the surrey line – contaminants would need to be removed so that only salts are discharged. These are regulated discharges.
- Add a recommendation on continuing to pursue Delta conveyance as an alternative.
- Page 18-19: The second paragraph needs to be developed.
- Policies section needs to include system approach (more hear, but can't be heard).
- Planning section, last paragraph: This should include system approach considerations as well.
- Planning section, bullets on regional plans: Clarify what is intended regarding the fourth bullet (land use planning) and the eighth bullet (monitoring the implementation strategy). On the last bullet, say "...and other changes AND NEEDS appropriately."
- Planning section: Rather than creating an additional local/regional report to prepare for the state, why don't we recommend amending the Urban Water Management Planning Act to have agencies address salinity management in their UWMP plans? It was noted that UWMPs would provide partial coverage – they do not encompass all areas of the state and focus on supplies and not wastewater.
- Page 18-20, Conclusion, first paragraph: include state agencies as a target audience.

The finance recommendations were contained in the 2009 RMS. The finance plan will consider how these proposals might be bundled or considered in the context of all funding recommendations. The following comments were provided:

- There is already a mil tax on fertilizer that is used to research nitrates – is the recommendation in addition to the current tax or a substitute?
- Text will be provided regarding fertilizer education.
- For the third bullet on salt surcharges for diversions, delete the words "within adjudicated basins"
- Who would collect funds and how would they be distributed?

Workshop participants were encouraged to think about potential metrics for measuring progress on the RMS recommendations.

## REFERENCES

There references section will capture direct citations and related reading.



## Attendance

### In person:

Jeanne Chilcott, Central Valley Water Boards  
Charles Gardiner, Delta Vision Foundation  
Amrith Gunasekara, Department of Food and Agriculture Science Advisor  
Bruce Houdesheldt, Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition  
Karl Longley, California Water Institute  
Sandy Schubert, Undersecretary, Department of Food and Agriculture  
Jamil Ibrahim, MWH  
Jose Alarcon, DWR  
Megan Fidell, DWR  
Nancy King, DWR  
Hoa Ly, DWR  
Paul Massera, DWR  
Toni Pezzetti, DWR

### Via webinar:

Matt Bao, Los Angeles County Sanitation District  
Dave Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies  
Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District  
Jeff Mosher, National Water Research Institute  
Roberta Tassej, Bureau of Reclamation  
Mike Uhrhammer, Padre Dam  
Betty Yee, Water Boards  
Jose Fario, DWR-Fresno

Facilitation: Lisa Beutler, MWH, Executive Facilitator; Charlotte Chorneau, CCP, Facilitation Support